

ORIGINAL RESEARCH**Assessment of effect of Medihope medicine in chemotherapy of cancer patients****¹Dr Rohan B Kharde, ²Dr Supriya R Vikhe, ³Dr Madhuri Sonawane, Rashmi Kharde**

¹Associate Professor, Department of Radiotherapy and Oncology, Dr Vithalrao Vikhe Patil Foundation's Medical College and Hospital, Maharashtra University of Health Sciences Nashik, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, India

²Hon. Consultant, Department of Dermatology, Dr Vithalrao Vikhe Patil Foundation's Medical College and Hospital, Vilad Ghat, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, India

³Consultant Hope Ayurvedic Medicines Pvt Ltd, Sangamwadi, Pune, Maharashtra, India. Associate Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Dr Balasaheb Vikhe Patil Medical College, Pravara Institute of Medical Sciences(DU) Loni, Rahata, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, India

Correspondence:

Dr Rohan B Kharde

Associate Professor, Department of Radiotherapy and Oncology, Dr Vithalrao Vikhe Patil Foundation's Medical College and Hospital, Maharashtra University of Health Sciences Nashik, Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, India

Email: drrohankharde@gmail.com**Abstract**

Background: Medihope medicine supplies proper, sufficient blood and oxygen to every cell and organ of the body. The present study was conducted to assess the effect of Medihope medicine in chemotherapy of cancer patients.

Materials & Methods: 100 cancer patients of both genders were given cycle of chemotherapy as per schedule. All were also provided with powder Medihope. Pre and post symptoms of vomiting, skin rashes, appetite, digestive complains, immunity status, confidence status was assessed.

Results: Out of 100 patients, males were 48 and females were 52. Itching was present in 2 patients. Post appetite was adequate in 11, inadequate in 67 and improved in 22. Post digestive complains were constipation was seen in 4, loose motion in 3. 24 had reduced weight loss and 68 had increased weight. Post immunity status was normal in 6, improved in 78 and poor in 16. Post confidence status was good in 2, normal in 2, improved in 87 and poor in 7. Nausea patients reduced to 26 after use of medicine. 1-2 episodes of vomiting per day reduced from 55 to 5, extensive vomiting from 42 to 8 and completely stopped in 84. Itching patients decreased from 5 to 2. Appetite improved in 67 post-operatively. Constipation decreased from 7 to 4 and loose motion was seen in 3. Weight loss reduced from 92 to 24. Immunity improved in 78 patients. Confidence level improved in 87 patients.

Conclusion: On taking "MEDIHOPE" Medicine along with Allopathy patient recovers speedily without any side effects.

Key words: Cancer, Medihope, allopathy

Introduction

Cancer is the second leading cause of death in the world, especially lung cancer (1.69 million deaths). Nearly a quarter of a million new cases of cancer were diagnosed every year in men. The most common cancers in men were head and neck(26%) , colorectal (16.6%), lung

(15.1%) and urinary bladder (11.7%) cancer; and in women, breast (28.0%), cervix (20%), colorectal (16.9%), uterus (6.2%) and lung (6.0%) cancer were the most common.¹

Medihope medicine supplies proper, sufficient blood and oxygen to every cell and organ of the body. It also boosts body immunity which is helpful to treat cancer and helps to prohibit the growth of tumour.² It increases Haemoglobin and platelets count, WBC count comes in normal range. All the side effects of chemotherapy and radiation also decrease. It reduces nausea and vomiting, reduces weakness, improves body immune system, reduces hair loss, controls body heat or temperature, increases body energy, improves digestion system and increases appetite, helps to gain weight.³ If this medicine will be taken along with chemotherapy/radiation then the success rate of recovery of the disease is more than 95%. It helps to decrease skin rashes and hyper pigmentation.⁴ It can be taken before chemotherapy or along with chemotherapy or radiation. It helps to prevent the side effects of chemotherapy/radiation and also reduces the chances of recurrence.⁵ The present study was conducted to assess the effect of Medihope medicine in chemotherapy of cancer patients.

Materials & Methods

The present study comprised of 100 cancer patients of both genders. All gave their written consent for the participation in the study.

Data such as name, age, gender etc. was recorded. A thorough clinical examination was carried out. All were given cycle of chemotherapy as per schedule. All were also provided with powder Medihope. Pre and post symptoms of vomiting, skin rashes, appetite, digestive complains, immunity status, confidence status was assessed. Data thus obtained were subjected to statistical analysis. P value < 0.05 was considered significant.

Results

Table I Distribution of patients

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Female	52	52.0
Male	48	48.0
Total	100	100.0

Table I shows that out of 100 patients, males were 48 and females were 52.

Table II Comparison of pre and post skin rashes

PRE	POST		Total
	Itching	No complains	
Itching	02	0	02
No complains	03	95	98
Total	05	95	100

Table II shows that itching was present in 2 patients.

Table III Comparison of pre and post appetite

PRE	POST			Total
	Adequate	Inadequate	Improved	
Adequate	11	0	0	11
Inadequate	0	67	22	89
Total	11	67	22	100

Table III shows that post appetite was adequate in 11, inadequate in 67 and improved in 22.

Table IV Comparison of pre and post digestive complains

PRE	POST			Total
	Constipation	Loose motion	No complains	
Constipation	04	0	0	04
No complains	03	03	87	93
Loose motion	0	0	03	03
Total	07	03	90	100

Table IV shows that post digestive complains were constipation was seen in 4, loose motion in 3.

Table V Comparison of pre and post weight loss

PRE	POST			Total
	No Weight loss	Reduced	Increased	
No Weight loss	08	0	0	08
Reduced	0	24	68	92
Total	08	24	68	100

Table V shows that 24 had reduced weight loss and 68 had increased weight.

Table VI Comparison of pre and post immunity status

PRE	POST			Total
	Improved	Poor	Normal	
Normal	0	0	06	06
Poor	78	16	0	94
Total	78	16	06	100

Table VI shows that post immunity status was normal in 6, improved in 78 and poor in 16.

Table VII Comparison of pre and post confidence status

PRE	POST				Total
	Good	Poor	Normal	Improved	
Good	02	0	02	02	06
Poor	0	07	0	85	94
Total	02	07	02	87	100

Table VII shows that post confidence status was good in 2, normal in 2, improved in 87 and poor in 7.

Table VIII Comparison of Nausea

Nausea	Pre	Post
Present	100	26
Absent	0	74
Total	100	100

Table VIII shows that nausea patients reduced to 26 after use of medicine.

Table IX Assessment of cases of Vomiting

Vomiting	Pre	Post
No episodes	03	03
1-2 episodes per day	55	05
Extensive vomiting	42	08

Completely stopped	-	84
Total	100	100

Table IX shows that 1-2 episodes of vomiting per day reduced from 55 to 5, extensive vomiting from 42 to 8 and completely stopped in 84.

Table X Assessment of skin rash

Skin rash	Pre	Post
No complains	98	95
Itching	02	05
Total	100	100

Table X shows that itching patients increased from 2 to 5.

Table XI Assessment of Appetite

Appetite	Pre	Post
Adequate	11	11
Inadequate	89	22
Improved	-	67
Total	100	100

Table XI shows that appetite improved in 67 post- operatively.

Table XII Assessment of digestive complains

Digestive complains	Pre	Post
Constipation	04	07
No complains	93	90
Present	03	0
Loose motion	-	03
Total	100	100

Table XII shows that constipation increased from 4 to 7 and loose motion was seen in 3.

Table XIII Assessment of weight loss

Weight loss	Pre	Post
No weight loss	08	08
Reduced	92	24
Increased	-	68
Total	100	100

Table XIII shows that weight loss reduced from 92 to 24 and increased to 68.

Table XIV Assessment of immunity

Immunity	Pre	Post
Normal	06	06
Poor	94	16
Improved	-	78
Total	100	100

Table XIV shows that immunity improved in 78 patients.

Table XV Assessment of confidence level

Confidence level	Pre	Post
Good	06	02
Poor	94	09

Normal	-	02
Improved	-	87
Total	100	100

Table XV shows that confidence level improved in 87 patients.

Discussion

By using the herbs available in nature, they feel better. This concept belongs to human beings also.⁶ When every cell and organ of the body gets sufficient blood supply along with sufficient oxygen they function properly and it ultimately boosts body immunity.⁷ If there is proper blood circulation and immunity, generally person won't fall sick. By using this basic concept Hope Ayurvedic Medicines Pvt. Ltd. Company introduced herbal medicine which has a patent from the Government of India.^{8,9} The present study was conducted to assess the effect of Medihope medicine in chemotherapy of cancer patients

We found that out of 100 patients, males were 48 and females were 52. Itching was present in 2 patients. Post appetite was adequate in 11, inadequate in 67 and improved in 22. Post digestive complains were constipation was seen in 4, loose motion in 3. 24 had reduced weight loss and 68 had increased weight. Post immunity status was normal in 6, improved in 78 and poor in 16. Deshmukh et al¹⁰ assessed the effectiveness of combinations of Ayurvedic drugs in alleviating the toxicity of chemotherapy and improving the quality of life of cancer patients. Random patients with malignancies of different tissues, grades, and stages were divided into two groups according to their treatment modality. Group 1 consisted of 15 patients treated with six cycles of chemotherapy alone and who did not receive any Ayurvedic drugs (control group). Group 2 consisted of patients (divided into three arms) who received Ayurvedic drugs during chemotherapy and after chemotherapy. Nineteen patients in arm 1 received the Ayurvedic drugs MauktikyuktaKamdudha (MKD) and MauktikyuktaPravalPanchamruta (MPP) along with a full course of chemotherapy. Fifteen patients in arm 2 received the same Ayurvedic treatment, but the treatment was started after completing the sixth cycle of chemotherapy. Eighteen patients in arm 3 received the Suvarnabhasmadi formulation (SBD) in addition to MKD and MPP after completing the sixth cycle of chemotherapy. Treatment was given for 16 weeks in all three arms. Patients from both groups were observed for a period of 6 months. The assessment criteria depended on Common Toxicity Criteria (CTC designed by NIH and NCI): haemogram; weight; physical examination including Quality of Life Questionnaire (QLQ designed by the European Organization of Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC)) for functional, symptom and global scores; and Karnofsky score for assessment of general well-being and activities of daily life. ECOG (Eastern Cooperation Oncology Group) score was also additionally included for assessment of symptoms.

We found that post confidence status was good in 2, normal in 2, improved in 87 and poor in 7. Nausea patients reduced to 26 after use of medicine. 1-2 episodes of vomiting per day reduced from 55 to 5, extensive vomiting from 42 to 8 and completely stopped in 84. Itching patients increased from 2 to 5. Appetite improved in 67 post-operatively. Constipation decreased from 7 to 4 and loose motion was seen in 3. Weight loss reduced from 92 to 24 and increased to 68. Immunity improved in 78 patients. Confidence level improved in 87 patients. It is composed of Lantana camara-35%, Tectona grandis-35%, Murraya paniculate-10%, Terminalia paniculate-10%, Toddalia asiatica-05% and N. foetida-05%. Vyas et al¹¹ have reported the use of RasayanaAvaleha as adjunct therapy to reduce the side effects of radiation and chemotherapy treatment in cancer.

The limitation the study is small sample size.

Conclusion

Authors found that on taking “MEDIHOPE” Medicine along with Allopathy patient recovers speedily without any side effects.

References

1. Aaronson NK, Ahmedzai S, Bergman B, Bullinger M, Cull A, Duez NJ, Filiberti A, Flechtner H, Fleishman SB, de Haes JC et al (1993) The European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer QLQ-C30: a quality-of-life instrument for use in international clinical trials in oncology. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 85:365–376.
2. Crooks V, Waller S et al (1991) The use of the Karnofsky performance scale in determining outcomes and risk in geriatric outpatients. *J Gerontol* 46:139–144.
3. Oken M, Creech R, Tormey D, Horton J, Davis T, McFadden E, Carbone P (1982) Toxicity and response criteria of the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. *Am J Clin Oncol* 5: 649–655.
4. Dercksen MW, Hoekman, Ten BokkelHuinink WW, Rankin EM, Dubbelman R, Tinteren H, Wagstaff J, Pinedo H (1993) Effects of interleukin-3 on myelosuppression induced by chemotherapy for ovarian cancer and small cell undifferentiated tumours. *Br J Cancer* 68:996–1003.
5. Burish TG, Tope DM (1992) Psychological techniques for controlling the adverse side effects of cancer chemotherapy: findings from a decade of research. *J Pain Symptom Manag* 7:287–301.
6. Artherholt S, Fann J (2012) Psychosocial care in cancer. *CurrPsychiatr Rep* 14:23–29. doi:10.1007/s11920-011-0246-7.
7. Moreno S, Lutgendorf S, Sood A (2010) Impact of stress on cancer metastasis. *Futur Oncol* 6:1863–1881.
8. Dubey N, Mehta R, Saluja A, Jain D (2009) Antiulcer activity of a traditional pearl preparation: Mukta Bhasma Research. *J Pharm Technol* 2:287–290.
9. Goel HC, Prasad J, Singh S, Sagar RK, Agrawala P, Bala M, Sinha AK, Dogra R (2004) Radioprotective potential of a herbal extract of *Tinospora cordifolia*. *J Radiat* 45:61–68.
10. Deshmukh V, Kulkarni A, Bhargava S, Patil T, Ramdasi V, Gangal S, Godse V, Datar S, Gujar S, Sardeshmukh S. Effectiveness of combinations of Ayurvedic drugs in alleviating drug toxicity and improving quality of life of cancer patients treated with chemotherapy. *Supportive Care in Cancer*. 2014 Nov;22(11):3007-15.
11. Vyas P, Thakar AB, Baghel MS, Sisodia A, Deole Y (2010) Efficacy of RasayanaAvaleha as adjuvant to radiotherapy and chemotherapy in reducing adverse effects. *Ayu* 31:417–423.